

Docket No.: 255352001800  
(PATENT)

**THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:

Mark William James FERGUSON et al.

Application No.: 10/522,222

Filed: (Int'l) July 23, 2003

For: USE OF FURIN INHIBITORS IN THE  
TREATMENT OF FIBROSIS AND  
SCARRING (AS AMENDED)

Confirmation No.: 1601

Art Unit: 1654

Examiner: Satyanarayan R. Gudibande, Ph.D.

**COMMUNICATION TO ACCOMPANY A**  
**REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION**

MS RCE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants have filed a Request for Continued Examination in order to ensure entry of the amendment submitted with the Response to final rejection, which Response was submitted electronically on 5 August 2008. In an Advisory Action subsequent to this Response, the Office states that the specification does not support claims for the application of the furin inhibitor “directly” to the site of the wound. However, applicants believe this is in error for the following reasons:

First, claim 1 of the PCT publication which forms the specification for the present case requires that a convertase inhibitor (narrowed in claim 2 to a furin inhibitor) is “topically applied to the site of a wound.” Applicants believe this is the same as applying the inhibitor directly to the site of the wound. In addition, the second full paragraph on page 12 states that the medicament is applied to the site where a wound may be formed, again implying direct application. In addition, the bridging paragraph between page 11 and 12 states that disadvantages applicable to topical application of convertase inhibitors are not applicable in the invention method because in this case, “the effect of the inhibitors is directed to the region of the wound.” The previous paragraph on page 11 further clarifies that the application is so as to produce “localized” inhibition of convertase activity.

In view of these locations for support, applicants believe that the claim language is indeed supported by the specification as filed. Accordingly, the proposed amendment does not constitute new matter.

